

1 The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 IN RE WASHINGTON MUTUAL, INC. ) No. 2:08-md-1919 MJP  
11 SECURITIES & ERISA LITIGATION )  
12 )  
13 )  
14 )  
15 )  
16 )  
17 )  
18 )  
19 )  
20 )  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )  
29 )  
30 )  
31 )  
32 )  
33 )  
34 )  
35 )  
36 )  
37 )  
38 )  
39 )  
40 )  
41 )  
42 )  
43 )  
44 )  
45 )  
46 )  
47 )  
48 )  
49 )  
50 )  
51 )  
52 )  
53 )  
54 )  
55 )  
56 )  
57 )  
58 )  
59 )  
60 )  
61 )  
62 )  
63 )  
64 )  
65 )  
66 )  
67 )  
68 )  
69 )  
70 )  
71 )  
72 )  
73 )  
74 )  
75 )  
76 )  
77 )  
78 )  
79 )  
80 )  
81 )  
82 )  
83 )  
84 )  
85 )  
86 )  
87 )  
88 )  
89 )  
90 )  
91 )  
92 )  
93 )  
94 )  
95 )  
96 )  
97 )  
98 )  
99 )  
100 )  
101 )  
102 )  
103 )  
104 )  
105 )  
106 )  
107 )  
108 )  
109 )  
110 )  
111 )  
112 )  
113 )  
114 )  
115 )  
116 )  
117 )  
118 )  
119 )  
120 )  
121 )  
122 )  
123 )  
124 )  
125 )  
126 )  
127 )  
128 )  
129 )  
130 )  
131 )  
132 )  
133 )  
134 )  
135 )  
136 )  
137 )  
138 )  
139 )  
140 )  
141 )  
142 )  
143 )  
144 )  
145 )  
146 )  
147 )  
148 )  
149 )  
150 )  
151 )  
152 )  
153 )  
154 )  
155 )  
156 )  
157 )  
158 )  
159 )  
160 )  
161 )  
162 )  
163 )  
164 )  
165 )  
166 )  
167 )  
168 )  
169 )  
170 )  
171 )  
172 )  
173 )  
174 )  
175 )  
176 )  
177 )  
178 )  
179 )  
180 )  
181 )  
182 )  
183 )  
184 )  
185 )  
186 )  
187 )  
188 )  
189 )  
190 )  
191 )  
192 )  
193 )  
194 )  
195 )  
196 )  
197 )  
198 )  
199 )  
200 )  
201 )  
202 )  
203 )  
204 )  
205 )  
206 )  
207 )  
208 )  
209 )  
210 )  
211 )  
212 )  
213 )  
214 )  
215 )  
216 )  
217 )  
218 )  
219 )  
220 )  
221 )  
222 )  
223 )  
224 )  
225 )  
226 )  
227 )  
228 )  
229 )  
230 )  
231 )  
232 )  
233 )  
234 )  
235 )  
236 )  
237 )  
238 )  
239 )  
240 )  
241 )  
242 )  
243 )  
244 )  
245 )  
246 )  
247 )  
248 )  
249 )  
250 )  
251 )  
252 )  
253 )  
254 )  
255 )  
256 )  
257 )  
258 )  
259 )  
260 )  
261 )  
262 )  
263 )  
264 )  
265 )  
266 )  
267 )  
268 )  
269 )  
270 )  
271 )  
272 )  
273 )  
274 )  
275 )  
276 )  
277 )  
278 )  
279 )  
280 )  
281 )  
282 )  
283 )  
284 )  
285 )  
286 )  
287 )  
288 )  
289 )  
290 )  
291 )  
292 )  
293 )  
294 )  
295 )  
296 )  
297 )  
298 )  
299 )  
300 )  
301 )  
302 )  
303 )  
304 )  
305 )  
306 )  
307 )  
308 )  
309 )  
310 )  
311 )  
312 )  
313 )  
314 )  
315 )  
316 )  
317 )  
318 )  
319 )  
320 )  
321 )  
322 )  
323 )  
324 )  
325 )  
326 )  
327 )  
328 )  
329 )  
330 )  
331 )  
332 )  
333 )  
334 )  
335 )  
336 )  
337 )  
338 )  
339 )  
340 )  
341 )  
342 )  
343 )  
344 )  
345 )  
346 )  
347 )  
348 )  
349 )  
350 )  
351 )  
352 )  
353 )  
354 )  
355 )  
356 )  
357 )  
358 )  
359 )  
360 )  
361 )  
362 )  
363 )  
364 )  
365 )  
366 )  
367 )  
368 )  
369 )  
370 )  
371 )  
372 )  
373 )  
374 )  
375 )  
376 )  
377 )  
378 )  
379 )  
380 )  
381 )  
382 )  
383 )  
384 )  
385 )  
386 )  
387 )  
388 )  
389 )  
390 )  
391 )  
392 )  
393 )  
394 )  
395 )  
396 )  
397 )  
398 )  
399 )  
400 )  
401 )  
402 )  
403 )  
404 )  
405 )  
406 )  
407 )  
408 )  
409 )  
410 )  
411 )  
412 )  
413 )  
414 )  
415 )  
416 )  
417 )  
418 )  
419 )  
420 )  
421 )  
422 )  
423 )  
424 )  
425 )  
426 )  
427 )  
428 )  
429 )  
430 )  
431 )  
432 )  
433 )  
434 )  
435 )  
436 )  
437 )  
438 )  
439 )  
440 )  
441 )  
442 )  
443 )  
444 )  
445 )  
446 )  
447 )  
448 )  
449 )  
450 )  
451 )  
452 )  
453 )  
454 )  
455 )  
456 )  
457 )  
458 )  
459 )  
460 )  
461 )  
462 )  
463 )  
464 )  
465 )  
466 )  
467 )  
468 )  
469 )  
470 )  
471 )  
472 )  
473 )  
474 )  
475 )  
476 )  
477 )  
478 )  
479 )  
480 )  
481 )  
482 )  
483 )  
484 )  
485 )  
486 )  
487 )  
488 )  
489 )  
490 )  
491 )  
492 )  
493 )  
494 )  
495 )  
496 )  
497 )  
498 )  
499 )  
500 )  
501 )  
502 )  
503 )  
504 )  
505 )  
506 )  
507 )  
508 )  
509 )  
510 )  
511 )  
512 )  
513 )  
514 )  
515 )  
516 )  
517 )  
518 )  
519 )  
520 )  
521 )  
522 )  
523 )  
524 )  
525 )  
526 )  
527 )  
528 )  
529 )  
530 )  
531 )  
532 )  
533 )  
534 )  
535 )  
536 )  
537 )  
538 )  
539 )  
540 )  
541 )  
542 )  
543 )  
544 )  
545 )  
546 )  
547 )  
548 )  
549 )  
550 )  
551 )  
552 )  
553 )  
554 )  
555 )  
556 )  
557 )  
558 )  
559 )  
560 )  
561 )  
562 )  
563 )  
564 )  
565 )  
566 )  
567 )  
568 )  
569 )  
570 )  
571 )  
572 )  
573 )  
574 )  
575 )  
576 )  
577 )  
578 )  
579 )  
580 )  
581 )  
582 )  
583 )  
584 )  
585 )  
586 )  
587 )  
588 )  
589 )  
590 )  
591 )  
592 )  
593 )  
594 )  
595 )  
596 )  
597 )  
598 )  
599 )  
600 )  
601 )  
602 )  
603 )  
604 )  
605 )  
606 )  
607 )  
608 )  
609 )  
610 )  
611 )  
612 )  
613 )  
614 )  
615 )  
616 )  
617 )  
618 )  
619 )  
620 )  
621 )  
622 )  
623 )  
624 )  
625 )  
626 )  
627 )  
628 )  
629 )  
630 )  
631 )  
632 )  
633 )  
634 )  
635 )  
636 )  
637 )  
638 )  
639 )  
640 )  
641 )  
642 )  
643 )  
644 )  
645 )  
646 )  
647 )  
648 )  
649 )  
650 )  
651 )  
652 )  
653 )  
654 )  
655 )  
656 )  
657 )  
658 )  
659 )  
660 )  
661 )  
662 )  
663 )  
664 )  
665 )  
666 )  
667 )  
668 )  
669 )  
670 )  
671 )  
672 )  
673 )  
674 )  
675 )  
676 )  
677 )  
678 )  
679 )  
680 )  
681 )  
682 )  
683 )  
684 )  
685 )  
686 )  
687 )  
688 )  
689 )  
690 )  
691 )  
692 )  
693 )  
694 )  
695 )  
696 )  
697 )  
698 )  
699 )  
700 )  
701 )  
702 )  
703 )  
704 )  
705 )  
706 )  
707 )  
708 )  
709 )  
710 )  
711 )  
712 )  
713 )  
714 )  
715 )  
716 )  
717 )  
718 )  
719 )  
720 )  
721 )  
722 )  
723 )  
724 )  
725 )  
726 )  
727 )  
728 )  
729 )  
730 )  
731 )  
732 )  
733 )  
734 )  
735 )  
736 )  
737 )  
738 )  
739 )  
740 )  
741 )  
742 )  
743 )  
744 )  
745 )  
746 )  
747 )  
748 )  
749 )  
750 )  
751 )  
752 )  
753 )  
754 )  
755 )  
756 )  
757 )  
758 )  
759 )  
760 )  
761 )  
762 )  
763 )  
764 )  
765 )  
766 )  
767 )  
768 )  
769 )  
770 )  
771 )  
772 )  
773 )  
774 )  
775 )  
776 )  
777 )  
778 )  
779 )  
780 )  
781 )  
782 )  
783 )  
784 )  
785 )  
786 )  
787 )  
788 )  
789 )  
790 )  
791 )  
792 )  
793 )  
794 )  
795 )  
796 )  
797 )  
798 )  
799 )  
800 )  
801 )  
802 )  
803 )  
804 )  
805 )  
806 )  
807 )  
808 )  
809 )  
810 )  
811 )  
812 )  
813 )  
814 )  
815 )  
816 )  
817 )  
818 )  
819 )  
820 )  
821 )  
822 )  
823 )  
824 )  
825 )  
826 )  
827 )  
828 )  
829 )  
830 )  
831 )  
832 )  
833 )  
834 )  
835 )  
836 )  
837 )  
838 )  
839 )  
840 )  
841 )  
842 )  
843 )  
844 )  
845 )  
846 )  
847 )  
848 )  
849 )  
850 )  
851 )  
852 )  
853 )  
854 )  
855 )  
856 )  
857 )  
858 )  
859 )  
860 )  
861 )  
862 )  
863 )  
864 )  
865 )  
866 )  
867 )  
868 )  
869 )  
870 )  
871 )  
872 )  
873 )  
874 )  
875 )  
876 )  
877 )  
878 )  
879 )  
880 )  
881 )  
882 )  
883 )  
884 )  
885 )  
886 )  
887 )  
888 )  
889 )  
890 )  
891 )  
892 )  
893 )  
894 )  
895 )  
896 )  
897 )  
898 )  
899 )  
900 )  
901 )  
902 )  
903 )  
904 )  
905 )  
906 )  
907 )  
908 )  
909 )  
910 )  
911 )  
912 )  
913 )  
914 )  
915 )  
916 )  
917 )  
918 )  
919 )  
920 )  
921 )  
922 )  
923 )  
924 )  
925 )  
926 )  
927 )  
928 )  
929 )  
930 )  
931 )  
932 )  
933 )  
934 )  
935 )  
936 )  
937 )  
938 )  
939 )  
940 )  
941 )  
942 )  
943 )  
944 )  
945 )  
946 )  
947 )  
948 )  
949 )  
950 )  
951 )  
952 )  
953 )  
954 )  
955 )  
956 )  
957 )  
958 )  
959 )  
960 )  
961 )  
962 )  
963 )  
964 )  
965 )  
966 )  
967 )  
968 )  
969 )  
970 )  
971 )  
972 )  
973 )  
974 )  
975 )  
976 )  
977 )  
978 )  
979 )  
980 )  
981 )  
982 )  
983 )  
984 )  
985 )  
986 )  
987 )  
988 )  
989 )  
990 )  
991 )  
992 )  
993 )  
994 )  
995 )  
996 )  
997 )  
998 )  
999 )  
1000 )  
1001 )  
1002 )  
1003 )  
1004 )  
1005 )  
1006 )  
1007 )  
1008 )  
1009 )  
1010 )  
1011 )  
1012 )  
1013 )  
1014 )  
1015 )  
1016 )  
1017 )  
1018 )  
1019 )  
1020 )  
1021 )  
1022 )  
1023 )  
1024 )  
1025 )  
1026 )  
1027 )  
1028 )  
1029 )  
1030 )  
1031 )  
1032 )  
1033 )  
1034 )  
1035 )  
1036 )  
1037 )  
1038 )  
1039 )  
1040 )  
1041 )  
1042 )  
1043 )  
1044 )  
1045 )  
1046 )  
1047 )  
1048 )  
1049 )  
1050 )  
1051 )  
1052 )  
1053 )  
1054 )  
1055 )  
1056 )  
1057 )  
1058 )  
1059 )  
1060 )  
1061 )  
1062 )  
1063 )  
1064 )  
1065 )  
1066 )  
1067 )  
1068 )  
1069 )  
1070 )  
1071 )  
1072 )  
1073 )  
1074 )  
1075 )  
1076 )  
1077 )  
1078 )  
1079 )  
1080 )  
1081 )  
1082 )  
1083 )  
1084 )  
1085 )  
1086 )  
1087 )  
1088 )  
1089 )  
1090 )  
1091 )  
1092 )  
1093 )  
1094 )  
1095 )  
1096 )  
1097 )  
1098 )  
1099 )  
1100 )  
1101 )  
1102 )  
1103 )  
1104 )  
1105 )  
1106 )  
1107 )  
1108 )  
1109 )  
1110 )  
1111 )  
1112 )  
1113 )  
1114 )  
1115 )  
1116 )  
1117 )  
1118 )  
1119 )  
1120 )  
1121 )  
1122 )  
1123 )  
1124 )  
1125 )  
1126 )  
1127 )  
1128 )  
1129 )  
1130 )  
1131 )  
1132 )  
1133 )  
1134 )  
1135 )  
1136 )  
1137 )  
1138 )  
1139 )  
1140 )  
1141 )  
1142 )  
1143 )  
1144 )  
1145 )  
1146 )  
1147 )  
1148 )  
1149 )  
1150 )  
1151 )  
1152 )  
1153 )  
1154 )  
1155 )  
1156 )  
1157 )  
1158 )  
1159 )  
1160 )  
1161 )  
1162 )  
1163 )  
1164 )  
1165 )  
1166 )  
1167 )  
1168 )  
1169 )  
1170 )  
1171 )  
1172 )  
1173 )  
1174 )  
1175 )  
1176 )  
1177 )  
1178 )  
1179 )  
1180 )  
1181 )  
1182 )  
1183 )  
1184 )  
1185 )  
1186 )  
1187 )  
1188 )  
1189 )  
1190 )  
1191 )  
1192 )  
1193 )  
1194 )  
1195 )  
1196 )  
1197 )  
1198 )  
1199 )  
1200 )  
1201 )  
1202 )  
1203 )  
1204 )  
1205 )  
1206 )  
1207 )  
1208 )  
1209 )  
1210 )  
1211 )  
1212 )  
1213 )  
1214 )  
1215 )  
1216 )  
1217 )  
1218 )  
1219 )  
1220 )  
1221 )  
1222 )  
1223 )  
1224 )  
1225 )  
1226 )  
1227 )  
1228 )  
1229 )  
1230 )  
1231 )  
1232 )  
1233 )  
1234 )  
1235 )  
1236 )  
1237 )  
1238 )  
1239 )  
1240 )  
1241 )  
1242 )  
1243 )  
1244 )  
1245 )  
1246 )  
1247 )  
1248 )  
1249 )  
1250 )  
1251 )  
1252 )  
1253 )  
1254 )  
1255 )  
1256 )  
1257 )  
1258 )  
1259 )  
1260 )  
1261 )  
1262 )  
1263 )  
1264 )  
1265 )  
1266 )  
1267 )  
1268 )  
1269 )  
1270 )  
1271 )  
1272 )  
1273 )  
1274 )  
1275 )  
1276 )  
1277 )  
1278 )  
1279 )  
1280 )  
1281 )  
1282 )  
1283 )  
1284 )  
1285 )  
1286 )  
1287 )  
1288 )  
1289 )  
1290 )  
1291 )  
1292 )  
1293 )  
1294 )  
1295 )  
1296 )  
1297 )  
1298 )  
1299 )  
1300 )  
1301 )  
1302 )  
1303 )  
1304 )  
1305 )  
1306 )  
1307 )  
1308 )  
1309 )  
1310 )  
1311 )  
1312 )  
1313 )  
1314 )  
1315 )  
1316 )  
1317 )  
1318 )  
1319 )  
1320 )  
1321 )  
1322 )  
1323 )  
1324 )  
1325 )  
1326 )  
1327 )  
1328 )  
1329 )  
1330 )  
1331 )  
1332 )  
1333 )  
1334 )  
1335 )  
1336 )  
1337 )  
1338 )  
1339 )  
1340 )  
1341 )  
1342 )  
1343 )  
1344 )  
1345 )  
1346 )  
1347 )  
1348 )  
1349 )  
1350 )  
1351 )  
1352 )  
1353 )  
1354 )  
1355 )  
1356 )  
1357 )  
1358 )  
1359 )  
1360 )  
1361 )  
1362 )  
1363 )  
1364 )  
1365 )  
1366 )  
1367 )  
1368 )  
1369 )  
1370 )  
1371 )  
1372 )  
1373 )  
1374 )  
1375 )  
1376 )  
1377 )  
1378 )  
1379 )  
1380 )  
1381 )  
1382 )  
1383 )  
1384 )  
1385 )  
1386 )  
1387 )  
1388 )  
1389 )  
1390 )  
1391 )  
1392 )  
1393 )  
1394 )  
1395 )  
1396 )  
1397 )  
1398 )  
1399 )  
1400 )  
1401 )  
1402 )  
1403 )  
1404 )  
1405 )  
1406 )  
1407 )  
1408 )  
1409 )  
1410 )  
1411 )  
1412 )  
1413 )  
1414 )  
1415 )  
1416 )  
1417 )  
1418 )  
1419 )  
1420 )  
1421 )  
1422 )  
1423 )  
1424 )  
1425 )  
1426 )  
1427 )  
1428 )  
1429 )  
1430 )  
1431 )  
1432 )  
1433 )  
1434 )  
1435 )  
1436 )  
1437 )  
1438 )  
1439 )  
1440 )  
1441 )  
1442 )  
1443 )  
1444 )  
1445 )  
1446 )  
1447 )  
1448 )  
1449 )  
1450 )  
1451 )  
1452 )  
1453 )  
1454 )  
1455 )  
1456 )  
1457 )  
1458 )  
1459 )  
1460 )  
1461 )  
1462 )  
1463 )  
1464 )  
1465 )  
1466 )  
1467 )  
1468 )  
1469 )  
1470 )  
1471 )  
1472 )  
1473 )  
1474 )  
1475 )  
1476 )  
1477 )  
1478 )  
1479 )  
1480 )  
1481 )  
1482 )  
1483 )  
1484 )  
1485 )  
1486 )  
1487 )  
1488 )  
1489 )  
1490 )  
1491 )  
1492 )  
1493 )  
1494 )  
1495 )  
1496 )  
1497 )  
1498 )  
1499 )  
1500 )  
1501 )  
1502 )  
1503 )  
1504 )  
1505 )  
1506 )  
1507 )  
1508 )  
1509 )  
1510 )  
1511 )  
1512 )  
1513 )  
1514 )  
1515 )  
1516 )  
1517 )  
1518 )  
1519 )  
1520 )  
1521 )  
1522 )  
1523 )  
1524 )  
1525 )  
1526 )  
1527 )  
1528 )  
1529 )  
1530 )  
1531 )  
1532 )  
1533 )  
1534 )  
1535 )  
1536 )  
1537 )  
1538

## 1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
2 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
3 I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
4 II. ARGUMENT.....	2
5     A. The Applicable Legal Standards .....	2
6     B. The Outside Directors Have Not Demonstrated That	
7         The Court's Prior Analysis Of Their Control Over	
8         WaMu Is Incorrect .....	3
9     C. The Amended Complaint Adequately Pleads	
10         Section 11 Claims .....	7
11         1. In Accordance With The May 15 Order,	
12             Rule 8(a) Applies To The Amended	
13             Complaint's Section 11 Claims .....	7
14         2. Lead Plaintiff's Non-Fraud Securities Act	
15             Claims Should Be Sustained Even If They	
16             Are Found to Sound in Fraud .....	10
17 III. CONCLUSION.....	10
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1

2 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

3

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Atlas v. Accredited Home Lenders Holding Co.,</i> 556 F. Supp. 2d 1142 (S.D. Cal. 2008).....	3
<i>Batwin v. Occam Networks, Inc.,</i> No. CV 07-2750 CAS (SHx), 2008 WL 2676364 (C.D. Cal. July 1, 2008).....	6
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,</i> 127 S. Ct. 1955 (2007).....	2
<i>In re Countrywide Fin. Sec. Litig.,</i> 588 F. Supp. 2d 1132 (C.D. Cal. 2008) .....	9
<i>In re Daou Sys., Inc.,</i> 411 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2005) .....	2, 8
<i>Eminence Capital, L.L.C. v. Aspeon, Inc.,</i> 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	10
<i>Fouad v. Isilon Sys., Inc.,</i> No. C07-1764 MJP, 2008 WL 5412397 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 29, 2008).....	4, 6
<i>In re GlenFed, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 42 F.3d 1541 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	10
<i>In re Gupta Corp. Sec. Litig.,</i> 900 F. Supp. 1217 (N.D. Cal. 1994) .....	6
<i>Hollinger v. Titan Capital Corp.,</i> 914 F.2d 1564 (9th Cir. 1990) .....	4
<i>Howard v. Everex Sys. Inc.,</i> 228 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	4, 5
<i>Lilley v. Charren,</i> 936 F. Supp. 708 (N.D. Cal. 1996) .....	6

1	<i>McGuire v. Dendreon Corp.</i> , No. 07-800MJP, 2008 WL 1791381 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 18, 2008).....	3
3	<i>Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.</i> , 540 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	3
5	<i>Moss v. United States Secret Serv.</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2009 WL 2052985 (9th Cir. July 16, 2009) .....	2
7	<i>In re Stac Elecs. Sec. Litig.</i> , 89 F.3d 1399 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	9
9	<i>In re Stratosphere Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 1 F. Supp. 2d 1096 (D. Nev. 1998) .....	9
10	<i>In re Surebeam Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 03 CV 1721JM(POR), 2005 WL 5036360 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2005).....	9, 10
12	<i>Swartz v. KPMG LLP</i> , 476 F.3d 756 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	2
14	<i>Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA</i> , 317 F.3d 1097 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	8, 9
16	<i>In re Washington Mutual, Inc. Sec., Derivative &amp; ERISA Litig.</i> , No. 08-MD-1919, 2009 WL 1393679 (W.D. Wash. May 15, 2009).....	<i>passim</i>
18	<i>Westland Police &amp; Fire Ret. Sys. v. Sonic Solutions</i> , No. C 07-05111, 2009 WL 942182 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2009) .....	5, 6
20	<i>Wool v. Tandem Computers Inc.</i> , 818 F.2d 1433 (9th Cir. 1987) .....	5, 6
22	<b>STATUTES &amp; OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
23	Securities Act of 1933 §11, 15 U.S.C. § 77k.....	1, 7, 9, 10
24	Securities Act of 1933 § 15, 15 U.S.C. § 77o .....	3, 4, 6, 7
25	Securities Exchange Act of 1934 § 10(b), 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b).....	1
26	Securities Exchange Act of 1934 § 20(a), 15 U.S.C. § 78t(a) .....	3, 6, 7
27		

1	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.....	10
2	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) .....	2, 4, 7, 8, 9
3	Fed. R. Civ. P. 9.....	9-10
4	Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b).....	1, 2, 8, 9, 10
5	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....	2
6	Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) .....	10
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

1 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

2       In its May 15, 2009 Order sustaining certain of Lead Plaintiff's claims under the  
 3 Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act") against the Outside Director Defendants (the  
 4 "Outside Directors"), the Court addressed and rejected every one of the arguments presented in  
 5 the Outside Directors' current motion to dismiss. *In re Washington Mutual, Inc. Sec., Derivative*  
 6 & *ERISA Litig.*, No. 08-MD-1919, 2009 WL 1393679, at \*15, \*19-20 (W.D. Wash. May 15,  
 7 2009) ("May 15 Order").<sup>1</sup> Left without any new controlling authority or persuasive reasoning  
 8 indicating that the Court's analysis was incorrect, the Outside Directors simply repeat the same  
 9 arguments that were insufficient in their first motion to dismiss.<sup>2</sup> These arguments should again  
 10 be rejected.

11       The Amended Consolidated Securities Complaint (the "Amended Complaint" or  
 12 "Complaint") contains the same allegations of the Outside Directors' control over Washington  
 13 Mutual, Inc. ("WaMu" or the "Company") that the Court has already found sufficient. These  
 14 allegations demonstrate the Outside Directors' close involvement, through their membership on  
 15 the WaMu Board of Directors and relevant committees, with activities that illustrate their control  
 16 over WaMu and "affirmatively link board membership to WaMu's primary violation." May 15  
 17 Order at \*20. The Outside Directors' arguments to the contrary are mere echoes of their  
 18 previous unsuccessful motion.

19       Similarly, the Outside Directors again fail to demonstrate that the Complaint's allegations  
 20 demonstrate a "unified course of fraudulent conduct" such that the Securities Act claims should  
 21 be evaluated under the heightened pleading standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b).  
 22 Consistent with the Court's previous findings, the Complaint carefully separates the negligence-  
 23 based claims against the Outside Directors under § 11 of the Securities Act from the fraud-based  
 24 claims against other Defendants under § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the  
 25 "Exchange Act"). Thus, the § 11 claims against the Outside Directors (and the other Securities

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 <sup>1</sup> All subsequent "\*" references to the May 15 Order are to the Westlaw version of the Order.

<sup>2</sup> This brief refers to the Outside Director Defendants' motion to dismiss as the "DD Mot."

1 Act Defendants except Defendants Killinger and Casey) should be evaluated under Federal Rule  
 2 of Civil Procedure 8(a)'s notice-pleading standard. However, even if the Court were to find that  
 3 the Securities Act claims should be evaluated under Rule 9(b), the claims should be sustained.

4 For the reasons stated herein and in the Court's May 15 Order, the Outside Director's  
 5 motion should be denied.<sup>3</sup>

6 **II. ARGUMENT**

7 **A. The Applicable Legal Standards**

8 In reviewing the Amended Complaint on a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil  
 9 Procedure 12(b)(6), the Court must accept the Plaintiffs' allegations as true and construe them in  
 10 the light most favorable to the Plaintiffs. *In re Daou Sys., Inc.*, 411 F.3d 1006, 1013 (9th Cir.  
 11 2005). Dismissal is appropriate only where, viewed in its totality, a complaint fails to allege  
 12 "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*,  
 13 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1960 (2007); *see also Moss v. United States Secret Serv.*, --- F.3d ----, 2009 WL  
 14 2052985, at \*6 (9th Cir. July 16, 2009) (to survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint "must be  
 15 plausibly suggestive of a claim entitling the plaintiff to relief").

16 In deciding a motion to dismiss, a court may generally consider only allegations  
 17 contained in the pleadings, exhibits attached to the complaint, and matters properly subject to  
 18 judicial notice. May 15 Order at \*2 (citing *Swartz v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 763 (9th Cir.  
 19 2007)). The Outside Directors seek judicial notice of three documents in support of their motion  
 20 to dismiss, which were attached to a supporting declaration. DD Mot. at 9. These documents are  
 21 audit committee charters of three companies unrelated to WaMu – DTS Inc., VirnetX Holding  
 22 Corp., and Morgan Stanley – and have no connection with or relevance to this case. (The  
 23 Morgan Stanley audit committee charter is totally unrelated to Morgan Stanley's status as an  
 24 Underwriter Defendant in this case.) Thus, these documents are not any of the sorts of  
 25 documents that could properly be the subject of judicial notice on this motion, such as *WaMu*

26 

---

 27 <sup>3</sup> To the extent the Outside Directors join other Defendants' arguments on the current motions to dismiss (DD Mot. at 4 n.2), Lead Plaintiff respectfully refers the Court to Lead Plaintiff's briefs in opposition to the other Defendants' motions.

1 SEC filings, *WaMu* conference call transcripts referenced in the Complaint, or other documents  
 2 referenced in the Complaint. These three unrelated companies' documents do not become  
 3 judicially noticeable simply because they were filed with the SEC. Cases holding that it is  
 4 proper to take judicial notice of SEC filings on a motion to dismiss a securities complaint refer to  
 5 filings by the issuer that is a defendant, not to unrelated companies' filings. *See, e.g., Metzler*  
 6 *Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1064 n.7 (9th Cir. 2008). The Court  
 7 should not take judicial notice of the DTS, VirnetX, and Morgan Stanley documents, which are  
 8 inappropriate for judicial notice and also are "not necessary to decide the issues presented" in the  
 9 Outside Director Defendants' motion. May 15 Order at \*2; *see also Atlas v. Accredited Home*  
 10 *Lenders Holding Co.*, 556 F. Supp. 2d 1142, 1161 n.7 (S.D. Cal. 2008) (refusing to take judicial  
 11 notice of documents concerning other companies). Should the Court elect to consider any of  
 12 these documents, however, the Court has recognized that it should "draw no inferences in favor  
 13 of defendants from judicially-noticed facts." May 15 Order at \*2 (citing *McGuire v. Dendreon*  
 14 *Corp.*, No. 07-800MJP, 2008 WL 1791381, at \*4 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 18, 2008)).

15 Furthermore, the Outside Directors purport to "incorporate their arguments in support of  
 16 their motion to dismiss the § 20(a) claim in the Prior Complaint" without repeating those  
 17 arguments in their current brief and refer the Court to their opening and reply briefs in support of  
 18 their prior motion. DD Mot. at 4 n.1. Lead Plaintiff respectfully submits that this is an improper  
 19 attempt to evade the page limits applicable to the Outside Directors' current motion (which  
 20 includes 21 pages of text) and that the Court should not now reconsider the Outside Directors'  
 21 prior briefs. If the Court chooses to reconsider those prior briefs, Lead Plaintiff respectfully  
 22 refers the Court to Lead Plaintiff's brief in opposition to the Outside Directors' prior motion.

23 **B. The Outside Directors Have Not Demonstrated That The Court's  
 24 Prior Analysis Of Their Control Over WaMu Is Incorrect**

25 Section 15 of the Securities Act and § 20(a) of the Exchange Act both provide that a  
 26 person or entity can be held liable as a "control person" of a primary violator of the securities  
 27 laws to the same extent as the primary violator. To state claims under both § 15 and § 20(a),

1 Plaintiffs must simply allege that the defendant (1) exercised “control” over (2) a primary  
 2 violator of the securities laws. *See Fouad v. Isilon Sys., Inc.*, No. C07-1764 MJP, 2008 WL  
 3 5412397, at \*11 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 29, 2008) (citing *Howard v. Everex Sys. Inc.*, 228 F.3d 1057,  
 4 1065 (9th Cir. 2000)). The Rule 8(a) notice pleading standard applies to the Court’s  
 5 consideration of the “control” element of these claims. *Id.* at \*12. The analysis of “control” for  
 6 § 15 and § 20(a) is identical. *See Hollinger v. Titan Capital Corp.*, 914 F.2d 1564, 1578 (9th Cir.  
 7 1990); *Fouad*, 2008 WL 5412397, at \*11-12.

8 The Court previously and correctly held that, with regard to Lead Plaintiff’s § 15 Claims  
 9 for the October 2007 Offering, Lead Plaintiff had sufficiently alleged the Outside Directors’  
 10 control over WaMu:

11 Plaintiffs successfully state a claim for control person liability against all Outside  
 12 Director Defendants by alleging that, in a 2008 SEC filing, WaMu stated that “our  
 13 entire board are and have been actively engaged in formulating and overseeing  
 14 management’s implementation of risk management policies.”

15 May 15 Order at \*20. Lead Plaintiff repeats this allegation in the Complaint (¶670), along with  
 16 the other allegations the Court previously held to be sufficient to allege the Outside Directors’  
 17 control over WaMu. For example, the Complaint again alleges that the Outside Directors signed  
 18 the Offering Documents for each Offering (as defined at ¶677) (¶863); that they served on the  
 19 Board of Directors (¶863); and specifically how each Outside Director Defendant (except Stever  
 20 and Wood) served on the Finance or Audit Committee. ¶¶29-39, 658-71, 685-95. Lead Plaintiff  
 21 alleges that the Finance Committee members were responsible for establishing “a set of credit  
 22 risk concentration limits” (¶668); had been “receiving reports on the housing market regularly  
 23 since 2005” (¶669); and “the [Finance] Committee had heard from outside experts, such as  
 24 BlackRock, Standard & Poors, and Goldman Sachs, on various matters, including mortgage  
 25 servicing rights and credit losses” (*id.*). Similarly, the Complaint alleges that the Audit  
 26 Committee members, among other things, “assisted with the oversight of the integrity of the  
 27 Company’s financial reporting process and financial statements and systems of internal controls  
 . . . [and] approved and monitored the administration of policies addressing management of

1 operational risk" (¶661), and were responsible for reviewing "the adequacy of internal controls"  
 2 (¶662). As the Court previously held, these allegations are sufficient to allege the Outside  
 3 Director Defendants' control over WaMu. *See* May 15 Order at \*20.

4 Defendants mainly rely upon their assertion that the imposition of control person liability  
 5 here would result in liability for every outside director. DD Mot. at 4-12. The Court has already  
 6 considered and rejected this concern. *See* May 15 Order at \*20 ("Bare allegations of Outside  
 7 Director status are not sufficient to establish control person liability, but *Plaintiffs' allegation*  
 8 *goes beyond this to affirmatively link board membership to WaMu's primary violations.*")  
 9 (citation omitted; emphasis added). As discussed in Section II.A, the Outside Directors ask the  
 10 Court to consider the audit committee charters of three unrelated companies, which are not  
 11 properly subject to judicial notice. DD Mot. at 9. These Defendants' argument that their  
 12 responsibilities as members of the audit committee should not make them subject to control  
 13 person liability because other companies also have audit committees should be rejected, because  
 14 other companies' practices, even if properly before the Court, in no way excuse these Defendants  
 15 from the legal consequences of their control over WaMu's financial reporting and internal  
 16 controls. The Outside Directors' argument that holding them liable here would expose directors  
 17 of other companies to liability also has no merit, because if directors of other companies control  
 18 their companies at times when those companies publicly sell securities under registration  
 19 statements containing material misstatements and omissions, Congress has decided that such  
 20 directors should indeed be liable under the Securities Act.

21 The cases upon which Defendants rely (DD Mot. at 4-12) are actually in accord with the  
 22 Court's reasoning in the May 15 Order and are readily distinguishable from the control  
 23 allegations of the Complaint here. *See, e.g., Howard*, 228 F.3d at 1060 (affirming grant of  
 24 summary judgment where discovery demonstrated defendants did not have control); *Wool v.*  
 25 *Tandem Computers Inc.*, 818 F.2d 1433, 1442 n.9 (9th Cir. 1987) (allegations of director status,  
 26 without more, insufficient to allege control); *Westland Police & Fire Ret. Sys. v. Sonic Solutions*,  
 27 No. C 07-05111, 2009 WL 942182, at \*10-11 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2009) (dismissing control

1 person claims where plaintiffs offered no allegations of control); *Batwin v. Occam Networks, Inc.*,  
 2 No. CV 07-2750 CAS (SHx), 2008 WL 2676364, at \*25 (C.D. Cal. July 1, 2008) (allegations of  
 3 committee membership insufficient, without more, to show control); *Lilley v. Charren*, 936 F.  
 4 Supp. 708, 716-17 (N.D. Cal. 1996) (conclusory allegations of director status insufficient); *In re*  
 5 *Gupta Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 900 F. Supp. 1217, 1243 (N.D. Cal. 1994) (same). Indeed, with the  
 6 exception of *Wool* and *Westland* (which, as shown above, do not change the Court’s analysis),  
 7 the Outside Directors previously cited all of these authorities in their briefs in support of their  
 8 first motion to dismiss, which the Court considered in finding “control” in its prior Order.

9       Similarly, the Outside Directors again attempt to distinguish the Court’s previous  
 10 decision in *Fouad v. Isilon* (DD Mot. at 10-12). Their efforts are again unavailing. The  
 11 allegations of control here are even stronger than in *Fouad* – in addition to relying on Board  
 12 committee membership, from which the Court inferred control in *Fouad*, the Complaint provides  
 13 the Company’s own admissions of the Board members’ control. (¶¶659-70).

14       To the extent that the Outside Directors are relying upon the fact that certain of the  
 15 allegations upon which the Court previously relied in finding control for purposes of § 15 appear  
 16 under the § 20(a) claim of the Complaint and are not repeated wholesale in the § 15 claim (DD  
 17 Mot. at 12-13), this argument should be rejected. In accordance with the Court’s instructions to  
 18 make Plaintiffs’ pleading more concise, the Securities Act claims do not repeat all of the  
 19 allegations about the specific duties of the Audit and Finance Committees that are in the  
 20 Exchange Act claims. ¶¶658-71. However, Defendants simply misstate the allegations of the  
 21 Complaint by stating that the Securities Act allegations “do not include or incorporate any of the  
 22 Exchange Act allegations by reference.” *See* DD Mot. at 13 (purporting to cite ¶675). Paragraph  
 23 675 of the Complaint makes clear that Plaintiffs “specifically disclaim any reference to or  
 24 reliance upon *allegations of fraud* in these non-fraud claims.” ¶675 (emphasis added). Because  
 25 Plaintiffs’ allegations of control by the Outside Directors in ¶¶658-71 do not relate to or rely  
 26 upon their allegations of fraud, Plaintiffs did not disclaim the allegations relating to the Outside  
 27 Directors’ control under § 20(a), and the Court should consider those allegations in finding

1 control under § 15. At best, Defendants raise an issue that elevates form over substance, as those  
 2 allegations could be repeated in the Securities Act section of the Complaint, if necessary.

3 In any event, the allegations in the Complaint's Securities Act claims are equally  
 4 sufficient to indicate control over WaMu. The same facts that the Court found persuasive in  
 5 demonstrating the Outside Directors' control over the misstatements in the Offering Documents  
 6 – that all of them except Montoya signed the Registration Statement, all of them signed SEC  
 7 filings incorporated by reference in the Prospectuses, and all of them served as directors at the  
 8 time of the filing of the Offering Documents – are again alleged in the Amended Complaint's  
 9 Securities Act allegations. ¶¶685-97, 838, 863.

10 **C. The Amended Complaint Adequately Pleads Section 11 Claims**

11 **1. In Accordance With The May 15 Order, Rule 8(a)  
 12 Applies To The Amended Complaint's Section 11 Claims**

13 In the May 15 Order, the Court held that Rule 8(a)'s notice pleading standard applies to  
 14 Lead Plaintiff's § 11 claims against all Securities Act Defendants except Killinger and Casey.  
 15 May 15 Order at \*13-14. The Complaint again carefully distinguishes between the negligence  
 16 and fraud claims, expressly disclaims all allegations of fraud in the Securities Act claims, and  
 17 separately pleads the fraud-based First, Second, and Third claims for relief under the Exchange  
 18 Act and the negligence-based Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth claims for relief under the Securities Act.  
 19 The Complaint also affirmatively pleads that the Outside Directors acted negligently with respect  
 20 to the Offering Documents:

21 *None of the other Section 11 Defendants [i.e., other than WaMu] made a  
 22 reasonable investigation or possessed reasonable grounds for the belief that the  
 23 statements contained in the Offering Documents were accurate and complete in  
 24 all material respects. Due diligence is a critical component of the issuing and  
 25 underwriting process. Directors, officers, and underwriters are able to perform  
 26 due diligence because of their expertise and access to the Company's non-public  
 27 information. . . . At a minimum, due diligence for every public offering should  
 involve: interviews of upper and mid-level management; a review of the auditor's  
 management letters and a review of items identified there; a review of the  
 company's SEC filings (particularly those incorporated by reference); a critical  
 review of the company's financial statements, including an understanding of the  
 company's accounting and conversations with the company's auditors without*

1 management present; a review of the company's internal controls; . . . and a  
 2 review of critical non-public documents forming the basis for the company's  
 3 earnings. Red flags uncovered through this process must be investigated.  
 4 Officers and auditors must participate in the underwriters' due diligence, and non-  
 5 officer directors are responsible for the integrity of the due diligence process in  
 6 their capacity as the ultimate governing body of the issuer. *Had the non-issuer  
 7 Section 11 Defendants exercised reasonable care, they would have known of the  
 8 material misstatements and omissions alleged herein.*

9 ¶845 (emphasis added). The Outside Director's motion, arguing that Lead Plaintiff's allegations  
 10 "sound in fraud," fails even to address the Complaint's affirmative allegations detailing the  
 11 manner in which these Defendants acted negligently, let alone offer any persuasive reason for  
 12 disregarding these allegations and treating Lead Plaintiff's Securities Act claims against these  
 13 Defendants as fraud-based.

14 As the Court previously observed, "because it is possible for a defendant to participate in  
 15 the dissemination of fraudulent statements without awareness of the actual fraud, Rule 9(b)  
 16 applies only to those defendants also accused in the underlying fraud." May 15 Order at \*13; *see*  
 17 also *Daou*, 411 F.3d at 1027 ("[W]here fraud is not an essential element of a claim . . .  
 18 '[a]llegations of non-fraudulent conduct need satisfy only the ordinary notice pleading standards  
 19 of Rule 8(a).'"') (quoting *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1105 (9th Cir. 2003)).  
 20 Because the Outsider Directors are merely repeating arguments that the Court has already  
 21 considered and found insufficient, their challenges to the May 15 Order should be rejected.

22 First, the Outside Directors argue that because the topics of the misrepresentations and  
 23 omissions in the Offering Documents – WaMu's risk management, appraisals, underwriting  
 24 standards, and financial condition and results and internal controls – form the basis of both the  
 25 Securities Act claims and the Exchange Act claims, Lead Plaintiff's allegations against all  
 26 Securities Act Defendants sound in fraud. DD Mot. at 12-19. As the Court previously  
 27 recognized, the overlapping subject matter of these allegations does not mean that Lead Plaintiff  
*In re Countrywide Financial Securities Litigation* remains persuasive:

1 [I]t eviscerates § 11 to give all defendants Rule 9(b) protection when: (1) only  
 2 certain defendants are expressly alleged to act fraudulently; (2) a complaint  
 3 specifies unique, particularized facts as to those defendants; and (3) the  
 4 particularized facts raise a scienter inference as to those defendants, but not all[.]

5 588 F. Supp. 2d 1132, 1163 (C.D. Cal. 2008) (*quoted in* May 15 Order at \*13).

6 Second, contrary to the Outside Directors' assertions (DD Mot. at 15-16), the  
 7 organizational changes to Lead Plaintiff's Exchange Act allegations in the Complaint should not  
 8 affect the Court's analysis of the Securities Act claims. The new organization, far from  
 9 demonstrating that Lead Plaintiff's allegations against the Securities Act Defendants are  
 10 grounded in fraud, instead simply clarify the fraud allegations against Killinger, Casey, and the  
 11 other WaMu Officer Defendants. Although the Outside Directors broadly claim that the new  
 12 organization "effectively concedes" that Lead Plaintiff is alleging a common course of fraudulent  
 13 conduct throughout the Amended Complaint, they are unable to offer a single example of how  
 14 the amendments demonstrate fraud-based claims against the Outside Directors. The Outside  
 15 Director Defendants again cite authorities from their previous motion that are just as off-point as  
 16 they were before. *See, e.g., In re Stac Elecs. Sec. Litig.*, 89 F.3d 1399, 1405 n.2 (9th Cir. 1996)  
 17 (rejecting "nominal efforts" to disclaim fraud as a basis for § 11 claim where "no effort [was]  
 18 made to show any other basis" for § 11 claim); *Vess*, 317 F.3d at 1104 ("To require that non-  
 19 fraud allegations be stated with particularity merely because they appear in a complaint  
 20 alongside fraud averments, however, . . . would impose a burden on plaintiffs not contemplated  
 21 by the notice pleading requirements of Rule 8(a)."); *In re Stratosphere Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 1 F.  
 22 Supp. 2d 1096, 1104 (D. Nev. 1998) (plaintiffs merely "insert[ed] boilerplate language into their  
 23 Complaint stating that claims are based in negligence, not fraud"). The Outside Directors' new  
 24 reliance on *In re Surebeam Corp. Securities Litigation*, No. 03 CV 1721JM(POR), 2005 WL  
 25 5036360 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2005), is misplaced. In *Surebeam*, the court found that plaintiffs'  
 26 "minimal efforts" to disclaim fraud allegations were insufficient to avoid the application of Rule  
 27 9 to the majority of plaintiffs' claims. *Id.* at \*7. Further, the court held that claims against  
 defendants against whom plaintiffs had not alleged fraud would be evaluated under Rule 8. *Id.*

**2. Lead Plaintiff's Non-Fraud Securities Act Claims Should Be Sustained Even If They Are Found to Sound in Fraud**

If the Court finds that Rule 9(b) applies to Lead Plaintiff's § 11 claims against the Outside Director Defendants (which it did not before and should not now), these claims should still be sustained. As the Court previously held, the prior complaint's allegations of falsity (which have not changed substantially in the Amended Complaint) were sufficient to satisfy the Rule 9(b) standard as to Defendants Killinger and Casey. May 15 Order at \*15-17. Although the Outside Directors claim that Lead Plaintiff must implicate the Outside Directors in the fraud-based claims (DD Mot. at 21), they are incorrect. At most, under Rule 9(b), the Court must evaluate whether the Complaint "set[s] forth an explanation as to why the statement or omission complained of was false or misleading." May 15 Order at \*15 (quoting *In re GlenFed, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 42 F.3d 1541, 1548 (9th Cir. 1994)). The sounds-in-fraud doctrine does not import any scienter requirement into § 11 claims to which the doctrine applies. Because the Complaint continues to meet the Rule 9(b) standard already utilized by the Court, the Securities Act claims should be sustained even under the heightened Rule 9(b) standard.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Outside Directors' motion to dismiss should be denied in its entirety. If the Court dismisses any of Lead Plaintiff's claims (and it should not), Lead Plaintiff requests leave to replead. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a); Eminence Capital, L.L.C. v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (per curiam).

1 Dated: August 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

2 BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER &  
3 GROSSMANN LLP

4 By: /s/ Chad Johnson  
5 Chad Johnson (*pro hac vice*)  
6 Hannah Ross (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Jerald Bien-Willner (*pro hac vice*)  
8 Katherine M. Sinderson (*pro hac vice*)  
9 1285 Avenue of the Americas  
10 New York, New York 10019  
11 Tel: (212) 554-1400  
12 Fax: (212) 554-1444  
13 Email: chad@blbglaw.com  
14 hannah@blbglaw.com  
15 jerryb@blbglaw.com  
16 katherine@blbglaw.com

17 *Counsel for Lead Plaintiff*  
18 *Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Board*  
19 *and Lead Counsel for the Class*

20 BYRNES & KELLER LLP  
21 Bradley S. Keller, WSBA# 10665  
22 Jofrey M. McWilliam, WSBA# 28441  
23 1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3800  
24 Seattle, Washington 98104  
25 Tel: (206) 622-2000  
26 Fax: (206) 622-2522  
27 Email: bkeller@byrneskeller.com  
jmcwilliam@byrneskeller.com

*Liaison Counsel for the Class*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 14, 2009, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses on the Court's Electronic Mail Notice list.

# BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP

By: /s/ Chad Johnson  
Chad Johnson (*pro hac vice*)  
Hannah Ross (*pro hac vice*)  
Jerald Bien-Willner (*pro hac vice*)  
Katherine M. Sinderson (*pro hac vice*)  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10019  
Tel: (212) 554-1400  
Fax: (212) 554-1444  
Email: chad@blbglaw.com  
hannah@blbglaw.com  
jerryb@blbglaw.com  
katherine@blbglaw.com

*Counsel for Lead Plaintiff  
Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Board  
and Lead Counsel for the Class*

BYRNES & KELLER LLP  
Bradley S. Keller, WSBA# 10665  
Jofrey M. McWilliam, WSBA# 28441  
1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3800  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Tel: (206) 622-2000  
Fax: (206) 622-2522  
Email: [bkeller@byrneskeller.com](mailto:bkeller@byrneskeller.com)  
[jmcwilliam@byrneskeller.com](mailto:jmcwilliam@byrneskeller.com)

### ***Liaison Counsel for the Class***